Case 2:21-cv-00073-JDP Document 64 Filed 09/11/23 Page 1 of 2

_			
1	NAVI DHILLON (SBN 279537)		
2	navidhillon@paulhastings.com DEBORAH SCHMALL (SBN 112052)		
3	deborahschmall@paulhastings.com LUCAS GRUNBAUM (SBN 314180)		
4	lucasgrunbaum@paulhastings.com PAUL HASTINGS LLP		
5	101 California Street, 48th Floor San Francisco, California 94111		
6	Telephone: (415) 856-7000		
7	HARIKLIA KARIS (admitted pro hac vice) hkaris@kirkland.com		
8	ROBERT B. ELLIS (admitted pro hac vice)		
9	rellis@kirkland.com MARK J. NOMELLINI (admitted pro hac v	rice)	
10	mnomellini@kirkland.com KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP		
11	300 North LaSalle Chicago, IL 60654 Telephone: (312) 862-2000		
12			
13	Attorneys for Defendant PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY	•	
14			
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
16	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17	EASTERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
18			
19	CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING) CASE NO. 2:21-CV-00073-JDP	
	PROTECTION ALLIANCE,) UPDATE TO UNOPPOSED REQUEST FOR	
20	Plaintiff,) AUTHORIZATION OF SUBSTITUTE	
21	V.) SERVICE OF PROCESS	
22			
23	PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY,)	
24	Defendant.))	
25			
26			
27			
$_{28}$			

	Case 2:21-cv-00073-JDP Document 64 Filed 09/11/23 Page 2 of 2	
1	Defendant Pacific Bell Telephone Company (Pacific Bell) respectfully submits this update to	
2	its unopposed request made on August 30, 2023, for an order authorizing substitute service of a	
3	subpoena duces tecum upon Monique Rydel Fortner (Fortner) and Seth Jones (Jones). ECF No. 63.	
4	As detailed in its unopposed request, Pacific Bell seeks an order because both Fortner and Jones are	
5	non-parties with highly relevant evidence, but had been evading service of process since Pacific Bell	
6	issued subpoenas to them on August 4. To support its request, Pacific Bell filed two declarations.	
7	ECF Nos. 63-1, 63-6.	
8	On September 6, 2023, Pacific Bell effected service on Jones, and therefore an order	
9	authorizing substitute service on Jones is no longer needed. However, Fortner continues to evade	
10	service. Before filing its original request for special service on August 30, Pacific Bell attempted to	
11	serve Fortner no less than eight times, without success. See ECF No. 63 at 3. Pacific Bell has	
12	continued its unsuccessful attempts at serving Fortner since that filing.	
13	Under the circumstances, Pacific Bell asks that the Court grant its unopposed request as to	
14	Fortner. A revised proposed order has been submitted for the Court's consideration.	
15	Respectfully submitted,	

Dated: September 11, 2023

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

By: /s/ Hariklia Karis

HARIKLIA KARIS (admitted pro hac vice)

Attorney for Defendant PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY